

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

Masters Theses

Student Theses & Publications

1993

A Field Experience: Dual-Building vs. Single-Building Principals: How They Spend Their Time

Terry Diss

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Administration](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Diss, Terry, "A Field Experience: Dual-Building vs. Single-Building Principals: How They Spend Their Time" (1993). *Masters Theses*. 2093.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2093>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

Nov. 10, 1993

Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

A Field Experience:
Dual-Building vs. Single-Building Principals:
How They Spend Their Time

BY
Terry Diss

Field Experience

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Specialist In Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1993

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS FIELD EXPERIENCE BE ACCEPTED AS
FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

10/25/93

DATE

10-27-93

DATE

Abstract

This study focused on the amount of time principals spent on tasks related to instructional leadership. It was conducted between the months of January and May, 1989. The study examined differences in the amount of time that single-building principals spent on job-related tasks and the amount of time that dual-building principals spent on the same tasks. Tasks were categorized as either routine or related to instructional leadership. Data was obtained through the use of a survey which was mailed to principals selected from the east-central Illinois area. Principals were asked to estimate the amount of time they actually spent on various job-related tasks.

Both groups of respondents reported having difficulty spending a majority of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership. Only 36% of the single-building principals and 32% of the dual-building principals reported spending as much as 50% of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership. Careful consideration needs to be given when assigning principals extra duties or extra buildings to supervise if they are to be expected to spend a majority of their time providing instructional leadership. The use of a head teacher, delegation of routine duties to a secretary, and a decrease in the amount of extra assignments are possible ways to free up more time for a principal's instructional leadership role.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Overview	6
Introduction and Background	6
Statement of the Problem	6
Assumptions	8
Limitations	8
Operational Definitions	8
Chapter II: Rationale, Related Literature and Research	10
Rationale	10
Review of Literature and Research	11
Chapter III: Design of the Study	15
Research Questions	15
Sample and Population	16
Data Collection and Instrumentation	17
Data Analysis	17
Chapter IV: Results and Conclusions	19
Introduction	19
Results for Research Question 1	19
Results for Research Question 2	23
Results for Research Question 3	24
Results for Research Question 4	24
Results for Research Question 5	25
Results for Research Question 6	28
Chapter V: Summary, Findings and Recommendations	30

Summary	30
Findings	30
Recommendations	31
References	32
Appendix	34

List of Tables

Table 1.	Mean Response to Survey by Group	20
Table 2.	Group means for Instructional/Non-instructional Time . .	23
Table 3.	Individual Responses - Dual-building	26
Table 4.	Individual Responses - Single-building	27

CHAPTER I

Overview

Introduction and Background

As financial resources for education are diminishing, many public school districts are forced to examine ways to cut expenses. In Illinois, some districts are assigning administrators (principals) additional responsibilities. These additional responsibilities sometimes take the form of an additional building for a principal to supervise.

The topic of this study was selected by the author, in large part, because of personal interest. An article about dual-building principals appeared in the July-August 1988 issue of the Illinois School Board Journal (Eaton and White, 1988). This article detailed the results of a study conducted in southern Illinois. The study focused on the amount of time dual-building principals had to spend on routine tasks. The authors of this article found that dual-building principals were able to spend only about 33% of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership. This is in contrast to the single-building principals who spent approximately 48% of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership. It was after reading this article that the author's interest in this topic was aroused.

Statement of the Problem

Instructional leadership is a crucial component of every principal's job responsibilities. Schools with strong instructional

leaders typically do better than do schools with weak instructional leaders. The State of Illinois has mandated that principals will spend a majority of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership. However many schools, feeling the strain of too little money to go around, have attempted to cut costs by assigning principals more than one building to supervise. This would seem to make it even more difficult for a principal to provide the type of strong instructional leadership that is necessary for schools to achieve at a high level. In order to examine the amount of time principals are able to spend on tasks related to instructional leadership, this study surveyed both single-building principals as well as dual-building principals. The results of this study will provide feedback regarding the feasibility of assigning principals multiple buildings to supervise and still expecting them to spend a majority of their time on instructional leadership activities.

This study examined the amount of time principals spent on various job-related tasks. Comparisons were made between single-building principals and dual-building principals. One purpose of this study was to determine if principals are spending a majority of their time on instructional leadership (as required by state law in Illinois). The study examined the hypothesis that the dual-building principal is not able to spend as much time as an instructional leader as the single-building principal.

Assumptions

It was assumed that the responding principals were honest and sincere in attempting to objectively assess their time requirements and therefore that the completed surveys represented an accurate reflection of the way principals actually spent their time. It was also assumed that the principals participating in this study were representative of their respective populations.

Limitations

This study concentrated on principals in east-central Illinois. This area was selected because it was particularly relevant to the author and other practitioners in the area. It was felt that some generalizations derived from this study would be applicable to other areas of Illinois with similar demographics.

It is important to note that several other factors influence the way in which principals allocate their time. However, due to the nature of such a study, this field experience concentrated on the concept of having dual buildings to supervise and its effect on time allocation.

Operational Definitions

Dual-building Principal. A principal responsible for supervising two buildings. In this study, the two buildings were at two different locations in the same school district.

Single-building Principal. A principal responsible for supervising only one school building.

Instructional Leadership. One of the components of a principal's job responsibilities. Instructional leadership refers to the improvement of instruction. Staff development, evaluation, and curriculum development are examples of some of the different aspects of instructional leadership. Under Illinois law, a principal is required to spend a majority of his/her time providing instructional leadership.

Routine Tasks. Tasks/responsibilities performed by the principal that are associated with the day-to-day operation of a school building. Examples of routine tasks include telephone calls, paperwork, travel time between schools, budgetary matters, local, state, and federal reports, and discipline.

Attendance Center. This term refers to a building where students attend school.

CHAPTER II

Rationale, Related Literature and Research

Rationale

A decreasing amount of available money coupled with rising costs has put some Illinois school districts in a precarious financial situation. As a result, more and more school districts are forced to design and implement cost-saving measures.

Although the dual-building principalship is not an ideal situation, its use is widespread. In Illinois, according to the State Board of Education, approximately 350 principals outside of Chicago served more than one building in 1986-1987 (Illinois School Board Journal, 1988). Across the state there were approximately 800 more schools than principals. As more districts experience financial problems, the probability for principals to be assigned additional buildings as a cost saving measure increases.

It has been documented that a strong instructional leader is essential to the development of an effective school. In Illinois, principals are required to spend a majority of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership. As principals are assigned additional buildings to supervise, the amount of time for instructional leadership decreases.

Review of Related Literature and Research

According to the 1985 educational reform legislation enacted in Illinois (Senate Bill 730), principals are required to spend a majority of their time on instructional leadership.

School boards shall specify in their formal job descriptions for principals that his or her primary responsibility is in the improvement of instruction. A majority of the time spent by a principal shall be spent on curriculum and staff development through both formal and informal activities . . .

Illinois School Code (1988).

There is no doubt as to the importance that research places on instructional leadership in the school. The principal's role as an instructional leader has been documented by the effective schools research. According to Manasse (1985), " All of the factors consistently identified as characteristic of effective schools . . . are either directly or indirectly related to the effectiveness of principals" (p. 440-441).

If strong instructional leadership is essential to the development of an effective school, then it would follow that principals should allot a major portion of their time to this area. Are principals able to spend a majority of their time on instructional leadership? Several studies have attempted to answer this question. One study, conducted by Stronge and McVeain (Stronge, 1988), focused on 43 full-time principals in central Illinois. Daily activities were documented for a four-week

period. Each principal was provided a log in which to record his/her daily activities along with the time each activity/task required. When the principals' activities were analyzed and categorized, it was learned that of the principals responding, only about 11% of their time was spent on activities related to instructional leadership. Approximately 62% of the principals' time was taken up by school management tasks; that is, those tasks related to the day-to-day operation of a school. Included in the school management category were clerical tasks, budgetary responsibilities, building maintenance, noninstructional monitoring activities, general office duties, and numerous administrative tasks.

In a study which focused on the discrepancies between what a principal should do, and what a principal actually does, Sullivan (1982) found that even though research provided models and procedures as to how the supervisor (principal) should provide for the improvement of instruction, in reality the supervisor (principal) mainly performs a managerial function. As observed by Sullivan (1982), "The supervisor's major purpose is maintenance of the day-to-day operations of the school system" (p. 450). Another interesting result of the Sullivan study centered around inservice education and the evaluation of instruction. As an instructional leader, a principal should spend a large amount of time in these two areas. However, as noted by Sullivan (1982), "Supervisors spend so little time in these areas that they are peripheral rather than central activities" (p. 450).

The results of the research seem to indicate that it is important for principals to spend much of their time providing instructional leadership. However, the research also indicates that the routine tasks associated with the operation of a typical school generally take a large portion of a principal's time. If principals responsible for only one attendance center find it difficult to spend a majority of their time in instructional leadership, then it would follow that those principals responsible for more than one attendance center would find it even more difficult to spend a major portion of their time providing instructional leadership.

Recent studies tend to bear this out. According to Eaton and White (1988), dual-building principals spend an average of only 33% of their time on instructional leadership tasks. In this same study, single-building principals spent an average of 48% of their time on instructional leadership tasks. (It should be noted that in southern Illinois, where Eaton and White did their research, the principal is required to spend a majority of his/her time providing instructional leadership.)

A common theme among some of the recent articles on dual-building principals is the amount of stress involved, not only the stress felt by the principal but by everyone involved. As stated by Rist (1983), "Continually on the road between schools, always in the wrong building when a problem arises, and duplicating efforts at every turn, the dual principal is a prime candidate for burnout" (p. 29). Denenberg (1984)

states that ". . . the constant travel . . . gave me a schedule mentality and the recurring fear that my watch would quit somewhere enroute" (p. 46). Clearly, stress is a major factor of a dual-building principalship. As such, it needs to be considered when examining the effectiveness of the dual-building principal.

Several recent articles written by dual-building principals have described what it is like to function as a dual-building principal. (In some cases, principals were responsible for more than two buildings. See Denenberg, 1984.) According to Dunn (1986), "Administrators doing double duty face the danger of getting so bogged down in simply trying to keep the paperwork moving and the desk clear, that it is too easy to forget that the real focus of their positions should be the supervision and improvement of instruction" (p. 25).

CHAPTER III

Design of the Study

Research Questions

An important part of a principal's responsibilities center on instructional leadership. In Illinois, principals are required to spend a majority of their time providing instructional leadership. In an effort to determine if dual-building assignments were interfering with this mandate, this field study focused on the following questions:

Question 1. Are there any differences in the amount of time that dual-building principals allocate to various tasks as compared to single building principals?

Question 2. Are dual-building principals able to spend at least 51% of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership?

Question 3. Are single-building principals able to spend at least 51% of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership?

Question 4. What were the ranges of time spent on each item for dual-building principals?

Question 5. What were the ranges of time spent on each item for single-building principals?

Question 6. Are there similarities in the responses of dual-building principals and single-building principals with regard to the amount of time they allocated to various tasks?

Sample and Population

This study focused on principals in Illinois Educational Service Regions 13, 14, 15, and 17. These regions were selected because of geographic proximity to the author's location. A listing of principals in these regions was generated by the Computer Services Department of Eastern Illinois University in Charleston Illinois. Illinois State Board of Education files were used to generate the listing.

Because of limited numbers, an attempt was made to survey all dual building principals whose assignments were at two different locations. These principals were identified by having two different mailing addresses on the computer listing. Principals who had dual assignments that were at the same location were not included in this study. Principals in special education or private settings were also not included in the study. Due to the large number of single-building principals, a random sample was selected to be surveyed. A random starting point on the computer list was chosen. From this starting point every twentieth principal was selected. If the person was a single-building principal, he/she was included in the study. If not, he/she was by-passed. This resulted in thirty-four dual-building principals and 24 single-building principals composing the sample. Fourteen of the single-building principals returned a completed survey for a 58% return rate. Twenty-two of the dual-building principals returned surveys for a 65% return rate.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

Each principal participating in the study was sent a survey letter (Appendix A) which was developed by the author in conjunction with an Eastern Illinois University professor, Dr. Donald Smitley. The letter asked principals to reply to ten items associated with the duties of a principal. Principals were to list the approximate percentage of time they allocated to each item. The sum of all ten items on the survey was intended to equal 100%. The responses were compiled and organized into two groups (single-building principals and dual-building principals). The results were examined for similarities as well as differences in the responses of dual and single-building principals. A mean percentage was calculated for each survey item for each group. A descriptive summary of the results is provided.

Data Analysis

Surveys that were illegible or incorrectly completed were not counted. Not all survey responses totaled 100%. However, it was felt that the information provided was relevant and valuable and therefore, was included in the total count. Errors were more likely the result of mistakes in addition by the respondent or attributable to duties that did not fit into any category covered by the survey items than in any area that might greatly affect the overall results of this field study. Any survey that included additional job assignments, such as Chapter I Director or Special Education Director was not counted. In all, thirty-four dual-building principals were sent questionnaires and twenty-two

were counted. Twenty-four single-building principals were sent survey letters and 14 were counted.

Chapter IV

Results and Conclusions

Introduction

Responses for each of the ten items on the survey were tallied, averaged, and separated into two groups (single-building principals and dual-building principals). A mean score for each survey question was computed to determine the average amount of time allocated to each area. Table 1 details the mean response for each survey item according to the category of respondent. Responses to items related to instructional leadership tasks were combined to determine the total amount of time allocated to this area. This information may be found in Table 2. Individual responses are found in either Table 3, for dual-building principals, or in Table 4, for single-building principals. It is interesting to note the similarities and differences, as well as the range found within each group's answers.

Results For Question 1

Research question number 1 asked, "Are there any differences in the amount of time that dual-building principals allocate to various tasks as compared to single-building principals?" As indicated in Table 1, dual-building and single-building principals allocated approximately the same amount of time to most of the items. Their responses represent comparable amounts of time allocations with the exception of three items travel, student discipline, and routine tasks.

Table 1

Mean Responses to Survey Questions by Group

Question #	<u>Category of Principal</u>	
	Dual-building	Single-building
1. Public relations activities	4%	5%
2. Staff evaluation	21%	17%
3. In-service	3%	5%
4. Travel between buildings	5%	1%
5. Instructional program improvement	15%	16%
6. Meetings with parents	8%	7%
7. Student discipline	11%	18%
8. Staying current	4%	4%
9. Support staff supervision/meetings	6%	5%
10. Routine management tasks	23%	20%

Note. The values represent mean percentages of the amount of time principals reported spending in each area.

As might be expected, dual-building principals spent a great deal more time on travel than did their single-building counterparts (1% for single-building principals while dual-building principals reported spending 5% of their time on travel). The percentage of time dual-building principals reported spending on travel might even be greater than reported in Table 1 if the preparation time for leaving or arriving is taken into account.

A difference was also reported in the amount of time spent on

student discipline. Single-building principals reported spending an average of 18% of their time dealing with student discipline matters while the dual-building principals reported spending only 11% of their time in this area. One possible reason for this discrepancy might be connected to the size of the student populations. Typically dual-building principals serve buildings with smaller student populations than their single-building counterparts. Fewer students can usually be expected to mean fewer discipline problems. Another possible explanation for this discrepancy might be that dual-building principals simply do not have the time available to spend on discipline matters. It is possible that dual-building principals are forced to "streamline" their approach to discipline and are not able to spend as much time as they would like on student discipline. In short, they have learned to adapt their approaches and methods out of necessity.

A third area where some difference in time allocation was noted involved the amount of time spent completing routine tasks. Routine tasks included completing state forms, budgetary matters, phone calls, and paper work. As might be expected, dual-building principals reported spending more of their time completing routine tasks than did the single-building principals (23% for dual-building principals vs. 20% for single-building principals). Although a larger difference could be expected (two buildings might be expected to equal twice the paperwork), this was not found to be the case. It is possible that the size of the buildings (two buildings do not always equal twice the number of

parents, students, phone calls, etc.), has an impact on the amount of routine tasks to be accomplished. It is also possible that dual-building principals have developed highly effective procedures in an effort to lessen the amount of time they spend on routine tasks. Some consideration also has to be given to the school secretary. A highly efficient secretary can greatly lessen the amount of routine paperwork done by any principal. Some routine tasks may also be handled by a "head teacher". It should also be noted that the composition and nature of a particular building's staff can greatly influence how a principal allocates time. Some buildings seem to require much more guidance and effort to stay "on course" while other buildings practically "run themselves". The nature of a building's unique population also impacts significantly on a principal's time demands. Buildings with a high percentage of special populations may require more paperwork or more intensive supervision by the principal. Parental involvement, or the lack of it, also impacts the amount of time required to complete routine tasks.

Although not covered by this field experience, another area that greatly contributes to the demands on a principal's time is the assignment of extra duties. In some districts, principals are assigned additional duties such as director of a special program, textbook coordinator, or bus supervision. Any additional duty assigned to a principal requires some commitment of time on the part of the principal.

Results For Research Question 2

Research question number 2 asked, "Are dual-building principals able to spend at least 51% of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership?" In order to determine the amount of time devoted to instructional leadership tasks, answers to related items on the survey were combined and a mean score was calculated. Items 2, 3, 5, and 8 identify tasks related to instructional leadership. Answers to these questions were combined and used to determine the amount of time allocated to tasks directly concerned with providing instructional leadership. Answers to the remaining items were combined and a mean score was calculated to determine the amount of time allocated to non-instructional tasks. As can be seen from Table 2, as a group, dual-building principals reported spending only 43% of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership.

TABLE 2

Group Means for Instructional/Non-instructional Time

	<u>Category of Task</u>	
	Instructional	Non-instructional
Dual-building	43%	57%
Single-building	42 %	56%

Results For Question 3

Research question number 3 asked, "Are single-building principals able to spend at least 51% of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership?" To determine the answer to this question, procedures identical to those used for the dual-building group were utilized. Answers to items 2, 3, 5, and 8 were combined to determine the instructional leadership time allocation. The remaining items make up the non-instructional score. Single-building principals, like their dual-building peers, reported spending less than 50% of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership (42%).

As can be seen from Table 2, both groups of principals reported spending approximately the same amount of time on instructional tasks. This would seem to indicate that having a second building to supervise does not automatically detract from a principal's ability to provide instructional leadership. It should be noted that principals were asked to respond only with regard to the amount of time they allocate to each item. There was no measure as to the amount of difficulty or effort required to provide this time. Additionally, there was no mention as to whether one person required nine hours to complete a day's business while someone else required ten hours. Further investigation is needed to examine this area in more depth.

Results For Research Question 4

Research question number 4 asked, "What were the ranges of time spent on each item for dual-building principals?"

Individual responses to the survey items can provide both useful as well as interesting information when examined closely. It is interesting to note the variance among the different values for particular survey questions. Table 3 lists each dual-building principal's answer to each survey question.

An examination of Table 3 reveals considerable variance among dual building respondents' answers. On survey item two, respondents reported spending from 5-50% of their time on staff evaluation. The mean percentage for this particular item was 21%. Item 5, evaluating and improving the instructional program, had responses ranging from 2% to 50%. Of 22 respondents, ten of them reported spending 10% or less of their time on this item. The mean percentage for item 5 was 15%.

Results For Research Question 5

Research question 5 asked, "What were the ranges of time spent on each item for single-building principals?" Table 4 lists each single-building principals' response to each survey item along with the ranges for each item.

An examination of Table 4 reveals vast differences among single-building principals as to how they reported allocating their time. Survey item number 7 asked respondents how much time they spend on items related to student discipline. Responses ranged from 5% to 45% while the group mean was 18% for this particular area. Another area with

Table 3
Individual Responses to Survey Items by Dual-Building Principals

Respondent Number	Survey Item #									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	5%	50%	2%	2%	20%	3%	5%	5%	3%	5%
2	2%	20%	2%	1%	30%	15%	15%	1%	4%	10%
3	5%	8%	4%	15%	28%	10%	15%	5%	3%	7%
4	10%	15%	15%	5%	15%	10%	5%	5%	5%	15%
5	2%	25%	3%	5%	8%	5%	15%	10%	5%	22%
6	1%	10%	1%	1%	50%	3%	10%	5%	10%	10%
7	0%	10%	2%	5%	30%	20%	5%	2%	3%	23%
8	10%	11%	10%	1%	3%	5%	5%	10%	20%	25%
9	5%	5%	2%	6%	25%	12%	21%	2%	2%	20%
10	5%	15%	5%	5%	20%	5%	15%	5%	5%	20%
11	2%	8%	2%	10%	5%	5%	40%	2%	1%	25%
12	10%	20%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	5%	5%	2.5%	0%	50%
13	0%	25%	2%	10%	12%	6%	5%	5%	10%	25%
14	1%	35%	1%	7%	2%	7%	8%	2%	2%	35%
15	10%	10%	0%	1%	3%	5%	10%	1%	10%	50%
16	0%	20%	0%	5%	20%	10%	20%	0%	5%	20%
17	1%	20%	1%	2%	30%	2%	7%	1%	1%	35%
18	8%	16%	6%	5%	15%	3%	10%	9%	3%	25%
19	5%	50%	0%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
20	5%	20%	5%	5%	5%	20%	10%	5%	20%	5%
21	5%	50%	3%	2%	10%	5%	5%	5%	5%	15%
22	2%	10%	2%	0%	2%	10%	2%	2%	20%	50%
Range	0-10	5-50	0-15	0-15	2-50	2-20	2-40	0-10	1-20	5-50

Note. The values represent percentages of the amount of time dual-building principals reported spending on each survey item.

Note. The survey item numbers correspond to the items on the survey sent to principals. (See Appendix A)

Table 4

Individual Responses to Survey Items by Single-Building Principals

Respondent Number	Survey Item #									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	10%	15%	5%	0%	15%	5%	8%	7%	10%	15%
2	5%	4%	10%	1%	0%	0%	30%	0%	0%	50%
3	2%	20%	2%	0%	25%	10%	15%	0%	1%	25%
4	5%	10%	5%	0%	20%	10%	25%	5%	5%	15%
5	5%	15%	5%	0%	25%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
6	10%	30%	.02%	0%	10%	5%	5%	.08%	5%	30%
7	5%	14%	10%	0%	11%	5%	25%	5%	5%	20%
8	5%	30%	10%	0%	15%	5%	5%	5%	5%	20%
9	5%	15%	5%	3%	10%	10%	15%	5%	5%	20%
10	0%	10%	0%	0%	5%	5%	45%	5%	10%	20%
11	4%	20%	2%	2%	30%	2%	15%	5%	5%	15%
12	5%	20%	0%	0%	30%	5%	20%	5%	5%	10%
13	5%	20%	5%	5%	20%	10%	10%	5%	5%	15%
14	10%	20%	5%	1%	10%	10%	25%	5%	5%	9%
Range	0-10	4-30	0-10	0-3	0-30	0-10	5-45	0-10	0-10	9-50

Note. The values represent percentages of the amount of time each single-building respondent reported spending in each category on the survey.

Note. The survey item numbers correspond to the items on the survey sent to principals. (See Appendix A)

considerable variance involved survey item number 10. Item 10 on the survey related to the completion of routine management tasks. Responses for this area ranged from 9% to 50% with the group mean at 20%.

Additional examples of variance among the responses of single-building principals can be derived from Table 4.

Results For Research Question 6

Research question number six asked, "Are there similarities between the individual responses of dual-building principals and the individual responses of single-building principals?" In comparing individual responses to the survey items it is interesting to note some of the differences between how single-building principals answered as compared to how dual-building principals responded. On survey item 2, staff evaluation, only two single-building principals reported spending more than 20% of their time on staff evaluation, and none of them spent more than 30% of their time in this area. The dual-building group had six respondents who reported spending more than 20% of their time on staff evaluation. Of those six respondents, three of them reported spending as much as 50% of their time in this area.

Another area that yields interesting results when comparing the individual responses is survey item 5, evaluating and improving the instructional program. Only fourteen percent of the single-building principals reported spending 5% or less of their time in this area while thirty-six percent of the dual-building principals fell into the same category. Of the total group of respondents, both single-building as

well as dual-building, only one person (a dual-building principal) reported spending more than 30% of his/her time in this area.

Of the total group of respondents (36) only twelve principals reported spending 50% or more of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership. Of those twelve, five were single-building principals and seven were dual-building principals. Both groups had respondents who reported spending less than 20% of their time in this particular area. Two single-building principals and three dual-building principals reported spending 20% or less of their time on instructional leadership. Each group of principals had a person who reported spending as little as 14% of his/her time on tasks related to instructional leadership.

Chapter V

Summary, Findings, and Recommendations

Summary

This field experience examined the amount of time principals allocated to different types of tasks. The focus was the amount of time dual-building principals spent on tasks related to instructional leadership. Responses to a survey letter were examined to determine if differences existed between the way single-building principals allocated their time as compared to dual-building principals.

Findings

In reviewing the results of the surveys, both groups of respondents appeared to have difficulty spending fifty percent or more of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership. Only thirty six percent of the single-building principals and thirty-two percent of the dual-building principals reported spending as much as fifty percent of their time in this area. Two respondents reported spending only fourteen percent of their time on instructional leadership. Based on the survey responses, it did not appear that that a dual-building assignment in itself automatically prevented a principal from spending time providing instructional leadership. Although some differences in time allocation were reported, most of the areas examined by this field study yielded similar results between the two groups of principals.

Recommendations

In reviewing the findings of this study, it is clear that more than half of the principals responding to the survey were unable to spend the majority of their time on tasks related to instructional leadership. However, according to related literature and research, it is essential that a principal's primary focus be that of instructional leadership. In order to increase the amount of time a principal spends on instructional leadership, it is first necessary to decrease the amount of time spent on non-instructional tasks.

One possible way to increase the amount of time available for instructional leadership tasks is to delegate routine paperwork/administrative tasks to either a secretary or a "head teacher". Care must be taken not to overload these people in order to decrease the principal's workload.

Decreasing the number of additional duties a principal is required to perform will also help provide more instructional leadership time. Many school districts assign multiple duties to principals in addition to their main building assignments. Although this is seen as a cost-saving measure, it frequently comes at the expense of instructional leadership time.

It is essential that school boards recognize the importance of instructional leadership. It is even more important that school boards act upon this knowledge and make administrative assignments based on the research.

References

- Burlingame, M. (1988). Using a political model to examine principals' work. Peabody Journal of Education, 63, 120-129.
- Denenberg, D. (1984). Circuit-riding four schools - when more is not better. Principal, 61, 24-25.
- Eaton, W. E., & White, S. D. (1988). The dual-building may cost more than money. Illinois School Board Journal, 9-11.
- Franklin, H., Nickens, J. M., & Appleby, S. A. (1980). What activities keep principals the busiest?. NASSP Bulletin, 64, 74-80.
- Illinois School Code, Ch. 122 - 10-21.4a (1988).
- Jones, R. R. (1988). Venturing behind the forbidden door. The School Administrator, 45, 45-47.
- Manasse, A. L. (1982). Effective principals: Effective at what?. Principal, 61, 10-15.
- Manasse, A. L. (1985). Improving conditions for principal effectiveness: Policy implications of research. The Elementary School Journal, 85, 439-463.
- McCurdy, J. (1983). The role of the principal in effective schools: Problems and solutions. (Available from AASA, 1801 North Moore St., Arlington VA 22209).
- Rallis, S. F., & Highsmith, M. C. (1986). The myth of the "great principal": Questions of school management and instructional leadership. Kappan, 68, 300-304.

- Rist, M. C. (1982). Principals spread thin - the dual principalship. Principal, 61, 24-27.
- Rist, M. C. (1983). The dual principalship might be the costliest economy move you'll ever make. American School Board Journal, 170, 29-30,38.
- Rogus, J. F. (1988). Instructional leadership: An informal approach. NASSP Bulletin, 72, 17-22.
- Snyder, W. R., & Drummond, W. H. (1988). Florida identifies competencies for principals, urges their development. NASSP Bulletin, 72, 48-58.
- Stronge, J. H. (1988). The elementary school principalship: A position in transition?. Principal, 67, 32-33.
- Sullivan, C. G. (1982). Supervisory expectations and work realities: The great gulf. Educational Leadership, 39, 448-451.
- Ward, J. G., & Hildebrand, A. (1988). Will legislative mandates for instructional leadership improve our schools?. NASSP Bulletin, 72, 48-51.
- Where are the principals?. (1988). Illinois School Board Journal, 10.

Appendix

ADMINISTRATIVE TIME SURVEY

I. Percentage of time spent on activities

- A. Superintendency duties (if applicable) _____%
- B. Teaching duties (if applicable) _____%
- C. Principalship duties _____%
1. Public relations activities _____%
2. Staff evaluation
(includes pre and post conferences) _____%
3. Planning and conducting in-service
programs _____%
4. Travel between buildings _____%
5. Evaluating and improving the
instructional program _____%
6. Meetings with parents _____%
7. Activities related to student
discipline _____%
8. Staying abreast of current educational
research, methods, etc. _____%
9. Meetings/supervision of support staff _____%
10. Routine management tasks (state
forms, budgetary matters, phone
calls, paper work, etc.) _____%

TOTAL 100 %

II. Type of assignment (check one)

- _____ Superintendent/Principal
- _____ Single-building principal
- _____ Dual-building principal
- _____ Principal/Teacher
- _____ Other (please explain) _____

III. Total number of students in school district _____

IV. Total number of students in school(s) in
which you serve as principal _____